

interwoven confidence to both parents and children. Sometimes we say we can't put old heads on young shoulders. The boys will have to sow wild oats. Just bury such thoughts beneath the sod of time. Tell me children will have to engage in the low, sinful and degrading habits. They are idle words. We are held responsible for idle talk. Children do not need to sow wild oats if we all do our duty as Christians. They will be great, good, noble and true. Oh, let us plead for home training to elevate fallen humanity, who are wrecked mentally, physically and spiritually.

#### OUR DIFFERENCES

E. K. TEETER

While I place a very high estimate on the EVANGELIST and its editorials in general, there are some points of differences amongst us that seem likely to remain, but I hope we may be able to exercise the necessary patience. In EVANGELIST No. 31, you say: "If you have any doubts as to whether he ate the Jewish Passover on the night of his betrayal please read Brother Rensch's article . . . and your doubts will be dispelled." We who have claimed that Christ ate the Passover on the night of his betrayal have no doubts on that point, and all that Brother Rensch can say does not weaken the facts which are in our favor, and are easily reconciled with any Scripture bearing on that question.

Sometime in the year 1896, after the Passover question had been discussed at some length, by some of us, we were forbidden by the good editor to discuss the Passover question any more thru the EVANGELIST, and on our side we have peaceably obeyed, but the other side has continued to publish all they pleased. Now we do not think that they understand the points relating to the Passover any better than we do, and we are confident that Brother Rensch, with others, failed to prove that Christ did not eat the Passover on the night of his betrayal.

Matthew, Mark and Luke say, "Where is the guest chamber, where I shall eat the Passover?" Therefore if Christ did not eat the Passover, then he did not do what he said he would. It cannot be proved that Luke 22:16 is a correct translation or rendering as in the revised version. All other translations contradict the revised version in the rendering of that verse, and they are right, as the connection shows. Mark 14:18 proves they did eat it. American Union translation reads: "I shall eat of it no more," which clearly means I shall not eat of it again after eating of it this time. Any honest reader may understand this. But the time that Christ ate the Passover was not the regularly appointed time by the law of Moses, but twenty-

four hours before, on the first hours of the 14th, but it was the Passover in lieu of the regularly appointed Passover. It was the Passover. Christ called it the Passover. The disciples called it the Passover. Matthew, Mark and Luke all say so. If it were not so, then the disciples, the evangelists, did not tell the truth as they knew. The facts are not destroyed by eating the Passover on the first hours of the 14th, for it was a case of necessity, in which case Christ certainly had as much power to set a special time as Moses had in the case of those who were absent on a journey. It would have been impossible for Christ to eat the Passover at the regular time. The type must meet the antitype on the cross. Now as Christ ate the Passover, it follows that Matt. 26:4, 5 are easily reconciled. If Brother Rensch does not know, these facts might instruct him. The time and order of the institution of the ordinances are essential to a correct understanding of these institutions.

Now, dear brother, I have given you an idea of some of our differences, and if you feel like making some remarks in reply some time you are at liberty to do so.

#### A REPLY TO BROTHER WILT

GEO. A. COPP

The controversy between our brother and myself grew out of a word that I offered to one whom I honestly believed desired to know Christ. I pointed to him the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, and away from the ordinances of God's house as his Savior, to which I had been looking for years.

I told the "Inquirer" that ordinances were symbols and nothing more, and showed it, I think, clearly, in my last communication to the EVANGELIST. I said that baptism only symbolizes the taking away of sin, and that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin; that feetwashing only symbolizes our often need of purification, and our frequent partial defilement with the world "and nothing more"; that the eating of the Lord's Supper was only symbolical of the great marriage feast of the Son of God in the Father's kingdom "and nothing more"; that the bread and wine is to be perpetually observed as a symbol of the taking away of our sins "only and nothing more." Now what more need I prove? What more does our brother desire? And right here I would close but for other thoughts that it might be well for me to notice for our brother's good and that of others.

Some years past I was on my way to heaven walking backward. I had my face earthward to ordinances, and my back heavenward towards Jesus. Now this is an exceedingly dangerous, if not a fatal way of traveling. We are cautioned to remember Lot's wife and the

plowman for only looking backwards. We are repeatedly entreated of God to look upward, to Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, and away from the things seen. The Scriptures plainly say that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified," and "that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3:20, 28. "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God." Rom. 4:2. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Rom. 4:4. If salvation were by ordinances of the church then God would be in debt to us for salvation, but it is not so; but it is by grace thru faith, so that salvation excludes boasting; for it is the gift of God. "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God thru our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5:1. I never knew what that "peace" was until I looked unto Jesus for it. You will not find it in ordinances, I assure you, for I tried it for years to my full satisfaction.

In Gal. 2:16, we read that "knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." "Christ is become of more effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Gal. 5:4. If salvation is of works or ordinances, grace is of more effect and you who so justify yourselves are, in some respects, like unto evil spirits, "fallen from grace." If the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, then ordinances are symbols and "nothing more." But if the blood of Jesus Christ does not cleanse from all sin, then the ordinances are, as our brother claims, "more than symbols," and thereby such doctrine wrecks salvation thru the blood of Jesus Christ, but instead brings it about thru sinful man.

If baptism can and does take away sin then the church fathers were right, and we wrong in baptizing a candidate for baptism at his conversion, but instead should leave him, as the early fathers did, until he was nearly dead to take away as many sins as possible, and run the risk of pardoning what may remain. This method of baptizing for the pardoning of sin might keep some people wet with baptismal water nearly all the time, that is, if baptism is for the taking away of sin and does not "symbolize it only."

"The Scripture, the power of God unto salvation." That they are, but the ordinances only symbolize that power "and nothing more." The blood is the power. Just as the power house of the electric dynamo is the power that carries men to their destiny here on earth, so is the